Lahore

Printed
By
Gangaram Pathak
Gurukula University Press,
Gurukula Kangri.

PREFACE

The following pages were written to examine the data of Dr. Prannath regarding the Rigveda on the strength of which he regards it not an Aryan but a Sumerian document. As Dr. Prānnath's articles were published by the *Illustrated Weekly of India* the Editor of that paper was approached by the writer to allow him to review Dr. Prannath's novel theory in the same paper. But the writer was informed by the Editor of the *Illustrated Weekly* that he was not interested in such discussion. On his being reminded that as he had given such a wide publicity to Dr. Prannath's articles it was his journalistic duty to publish their criticism, if that was forthcoming, he expressed his inability to do so. Hence, these articles were sent to the Editor *Bombay Chronicle* who gladly published them in the weekly edition of the paper in February and March 1936. These articles are, now, being reprinted from the Bombay Chronicle and published in the form of a booklet by the Arya Pratinidhi Sabha, Punjab.

SATYAVRATA
Vice-Chancellor
Gurukula University.

29-5-1936.

IS RIGVEDA
A Sumerian Document ?
I

Dr. Prannath of Benares Hindu University has contributed a series of articles to the "Illustrated Weekly of India" in its issues of July, September and October 1935 on the Rigveda, proving it to be a Sumerian document. He has italicized the words "The Rigveda is not an Indian document." The theory propounded by Dr. Prannath is so astounding that were it to be accepted it would upset all our accepted notions about the Rigveda. However, it is the characteristic of the modern progressive mind that it is always open to conviction and does not regard anything as finally true. If some new factors step in in the hitherto unexplored field of

research an unbiassed mind is always ready to shake off the old for the new. So, if Dr. Prannath's studies in the Rigveda really shed some light on the origin of the sacred text we should at once accept his conclusions. But in our readiness to accept new things we should not forget that everything that is flung upon the world as new is not always worth acceptance. Acute discretion is of supreme importance in dealing with new-fangled theories which crop up and disappear like mushrooms.

I shall examine in detail the proofs given by Dr. Prannath to prove the Rigveda to be a Sumerian document, but before doing so I would like to make some preliminary remarks.

1. As will be pointed out in the following pages Dr. Prannath's line of argument in proving the Rigveda a Sumerian document is that there are common names of cities and kings in Sumerian history as well as the Rigveda, and therefore the Rigveda should be a Sumerian document. Taking for granted that there are common names in the literature of both the people, which I think is not only disputable

but entirely wrong as will be made clear in thi article, can it not be reversely argued that the Sumerian names are the Rigvedic names and that the Rigvedic Aryans had migrated from India into Syria, Phoenicia, Hitt, Akkad and Sumer. Following a different argument Mr. A. C. Das of Calcutta University has elaborately proved this in his book "Rigvedic India."

2. To prove that Rigveda is not an Indian document, and that it is a Sumerian document, all the hymns of the Rigveda should be capable of interpretation from the Sumerian language. But Dr. Prannath has made no such attempt. He has simply read or I must say misread some Sumerian names in the Rigveda and has jumped to the conclusion that Rigveda is a Sumerian document. If we come across some English words in a Hindi book are we justified in saying that the book known to be written in Hindi is really an English book ? For Rigveda to be a Sumerian document Dr. Prannath should not only point out a likeness between Sumerian and Rigvedic names he should also point out the structural and functional similarity, or rather

likeness, between the two languages. He takes one hymn, and then begins to interpret it now calling a word Sumerian and then immediately after taking the following words as Sanskrit. This is such a gross defect that it nullifies his whole hypothesis.

Now, I shall examine one by one the proofs which he has adduced in support of his claim that the Rigveda is a Sumerian document.

TATURI AND TUTULI

Dr. Prannath has sought to identify the Babylonian city Tutuli, which he calls the modern Hit, with Taturi of the Rigveda. Now, the similarity of the words is undoubtedly striking, but a scholar while making such comparisons should bear in mind that philology would not be worth a farthing if one were to go by external similarity only. There is a verse in the Yajurveda (XL. 1), "Isha pervades all this universe." If one were to go by the outward appearance of words or even by their sound one would say that here we come across Isaiah of the Old Testament. But this would be torturing the text. The word Taturi of the Rigveda has met with the

same fate at the hands of Dr. Prannath. It should be noticed that no commentator of the Rigveda has translated the word to signify a city. We easily understand why Swami Dayanand of the Aryasamaj did not translate the word in the sense of a city for he did not admit historical references in the Vedas, but why should Sayan and Mahidhar who read history in every page of the Veda translate the word otherwise ? Sayan translates the word Taturi as "destroyer" or "one who takes across" from the root "tri" to cross. The word is mentioned in the Rigveda in five hymns (I, 145, 3; VI, 24, 2; 88, 7; 22, 2; IV, 39, 2) and in all those contexts Sayan's meaning fits in very well. Under such circumstances Dr. Prannath should adduce some very cogent and strong reasons to support his contention. He should also try to give us a translation of the full text rather than haphazardly picking up a word without any reference to the full hymn.

Dr. Prannath has also in this connection talked of the traders of Taturi under the name of Tuturvani (Rig I, 168, 1). But here also he

has blundered philologically. The word in the text is not Tuturvani but Turvani which is derived from the word Tvara—haste—and has no connection with Taturi. Dr. Prannath has split the word as tutu-vani and has translated it as the traders of Tutu. But this is wrong. The text is tu-turvani. Tu in Sanskrit is an adversative particle meaning "but" and turvani means "One who does things with alacrity." Turvani is a Rigvedic term which is very common in the Rigveda and Nirukta (6. 14) has also translated it as given above. Turvani is mentioned in 1, 56, 3; 61, 11; 128, 3; 130, 9; 186, 3; IV, 20, 1; V, 35, 3; X, 32, 5 while if we were to regard the word as Tuturvani as contended by Dr. Prannath then the word comes in the whole of the Rigveda only once, i.e., 1, 168, 1 where also according to my contention as well as the translation of Sayan the word is not Tuturvani but Turvani and so it has nothing to do with the traders of Taturi. Dr. Prannath can point out to the Padpath—analysis of sentences—as given in Sayan, and say that there the analysis is given as Tutur-vani and not as Tu-Turvani and

so he is justified in splitting up the word as Tutu-vani and translating it as the traders of Tutu. But as I have pointed out the Rigvedic word which is most common is Turvani and not Tutu-vani. The latter comes only once in the Rig veda and that also in the hymn in question and by the mistake in the Padpath. Moreover, "the traders of Tutu" onveys no sense in relation to the complete hymn.

That Dr. Prannath's etymology of Tuturvani is wrong will be further apparent by our studying the word Tutu in the Rigveda. We come across the various forms of the word in Tutajyaat (I, 143, 6); Tuturyaat (VI, 63, 2); Tuturyaam (V, 45, II). Now, if Tutu were some District in which the city Taturi was situated, as has been pointed out by Dr. Prannath, then these words should be capable of being so interpreted as to throw some light on the Tutu District. On the contrary, any one having the slightest familiarity with Sanskrit grammar will be able to point out that here the word is used as a verb and all the above forms are different modifications of the word "Tutu".

"Tuturyaam" means "let us pass through." So where is the District "Tutu" here? If we split these words as Tutu-Jyaat, Tutu-Ryaat, Tutu-Ryaam then Dr. Prannath should be able to enlighten us as to what Jyaat, Ryaat or Yaat and Ryaam or Yaam mean?

The clearest indication of the meaning of Tutu will be found in Rig. V, 45, I where we come across the word Tuturyaam. The text is, "Ayaa dhiyaa syaam devagopaa, Ayaa dhiyaa Tuturyaam ati anhau". The grammatical order of the words of the latter portion of the hymn is "Ayaa dhiyaa anhah ati tuturyaam"-"through this our intellect let us cross in." This is the most natural interpretation of this hymn which even a novice in Sanskrit will be able to follow. If Tutu here stood for some town then Dr. Prannath should be able to give us a meaning of this hymn. And if Tuturyaam here has no reference to the District Tutu then I fail to see how a mere similarity between a Rigvedic word—Taturi—and a Babylonian city—Tutuli—could be trusted as a sound foundation on which to build the theory that Rigveda is a Sumerian document.

URU AND UR.

The Rigvedic word Uru has been identified by Dr. Prannath with the Babylonian city of Ur. In this connection only eight short lines have been written without any authority, without any proof. Students of Sanskrit know that Uru means "wide," and that it is not the name of any city. Why not in the same manner talk of Madina from its mention in "Jeevem sharadah shatam Shrinuyaam sharadah shatamadinaah syaam sharadah shatam" Yaju. XXXVI. 24). A mere statement where one is going to propound a great theory is far from what is expected of a scholar. Uru has been used more than one hundred times in the Rigveda and always primarily in the sense of the firmament because it is the widest thing that one perceives in the world. If Uru were the name of a city it would be so very easy to prove it because of the profuse use of the word that has been made of it in the Rigveda. But instead of proving his contention Dr. Prannath simply blames the Pandits for wrongly interpreting Uru as "wide" or "the firmament." I

have yet to come across a hymn of the Rigveda in which Uru can be correctly interpreted as Ur or the name of a city. Dr. Prannath should take up the word Uru and try to interpret it in the sense of the Babylonian city of Ur in a fairly large number of the Rigvedic passages and then only he should think of blaming the Pandits for wrong interpretations.

ISHAM AND ISHIN

The Rigvedic word Isham has been identified with the Sumerian city of Ishin. The reason why Dr. Prannath regards Isham as the name of a city seems to be that in Rig VIII, 6, 23 "Isham Puram" have been used together which naturally can convey the sense of the "city of Isham." But it should be remembered that the words Isham and Puram come together only once in the whole of the Rigveda and that also in the reference given above. In this hymn also the clear meaning is "O Indra disclose much Isha (food) for us, disclose for us Puram (cities) with kine." If we were to interpret the hymn as a search after the city of Isham then the word should be capable of similar interpretation in all the hymns

where Isham is used in the Rigveda. The word Isham or Ishah has been used 185 times in the Rigveda and everywhere the meaning "food" fits in very well. This is the traditional as well as the etymological meaning of the word. So merely by a partial similarity between the outer appearance of the words one cannot change their meaning. Modern philology lays greater stress on the structural and functional similarity of words of a language than on mere outward appearance. There was a time when scholars were busy in deriving all the languages from Hebrew and huge dictionaries were compiled out of their labours but with the advent of a deeper knowledge of the principles of philology all those attempts have been given up. Dr. Prannath has made a similar attempt in reading Babylonian and Sumerian words in the Rigveda.

AHAM RAJAN AND ISHMI DAGAN.

It has been sought to identify Aham Rajan of the Rigveda with the king Ishmi Dagan. First, there is no similarity between the two words. Secondly, there is no hymn in the Rig-

veda where there might have been any mention of the king Aham Rajan. Aham in Sanskrit means "I" and if the use of Aham with any other word makes it a proper noun then it would be a dangerous method of interpretation. That Aham Rajan is not the name of any Sumerian king is clear from the hymns where the words are mentioned. There is a mention of these words in Rig. II, 27, 17; 29, 7 and in both the hymns twelve words separate the word Aham from Rajan. Moreover, in VII 89, 1 we read Rajan Aham, i.e, "the King—I". In the whole of the Rigveda Aham and Rajan are grouped together only once in II, 28, 9 where too they convey the same sense which they convey when they are separate. Besides, if Aham Rajan were a proper noun how would Dr. Prannath interpret "Maa Rajan Aham gamam?" One can understand the use of "gamam" with "Aham" in the sense of "I". But if Aham is a proper noun then how is the use of "gamam" justified? 'Gamam' according to plain grammar means 'I should go'. It cannot mean either 'He or you should go.' If 'Aham' is a proper noun then it must be in the third person. No grammar can

justify the use of 'gamam' with the third person, though it is justified with the first person—I or Aham.

GUNGU AND GUNGUNUM

"Ishmi Dagan" dedicated a temple to Gungunum" says the Babylonian mythology. Dr. Prannath reads this story in Rig X, 48, 8 where the words are "Aham Gungubhyo atithigvam ishkaram isham na vritraturam vikshu dharyam." This has been translated by Dr. Prannath as follows:—"Aham Rajan lived for some time as a guest of Gungu." After translating this much, Dr. Prannath adds: "This is the explanation of the dedication of the temple to him." There are many problems here which Dr. Prannath must solve before he would have us believe in the hymn the traces of the story of Gungunum. First, the hymn does not speak of Aham Rajan but only of "Aham." So one cannot translate it by any stretch of imagination as "Aham Rajan" living with Gungu. The only reasonable translation of Aham is "I." Secondly, even if we admit the far-fetched hypothesis of regarding Aham as a proper noun, how can the living of Aham with Gungu mean "the dedication of the

temple" ? I wonder what has emboldened Dr. Prannath to state what does not exist in the hymn at all. Thirdly, "Atithigvam" has been translated by Dr. Prannath as "living as a guest." This is highly doubtful. Atithigva is a proper noun according to Sayan, Griffith and other translators. And there is reason to believe the word to be a proper noun because we come across the different forms of the word in various hymns. We read of Atithigvam (I, 53, 10; X, 48, 8); Atithigvasya (I, 53, 8) the genitive of Atithigva; Atithigvaaya (I, 51, 6) the dative of Atithigva. This shows that Atithigva is as good a proper noun as Gungu and should not be translated as Aham living as a guest with Gungu. Atithigva, Kashah Juvam, Divodaasam etc. are words which are grouped together in various hymns (I, 112, 14; IV 26, 3) and naturally give an idea of a proper name. Fourthly, excepting the similarity between Gungu and Gungunum there is no other similarity between the history of the words and so philologically there is nothing common between these words excepting some of the letters which also are far too many in the sup-

posed Sumerian counterpart of the Rigvedic word. Fifthly, the Rigveda mentions Gangubhyo—the dative plural of Gungu. If we are to understand by Gungu the name of the Sumerian king how would the plural here be explained. Nobody would think of a plural with a proper noun in Sanskrit. From a quotation of Mr. Gadd Dr. Prannath wrongly concludes that Gungunum was Ishtar or moon-goddess of Isin and then begins showing that Gungu of the Rigveda is also a moon-goddess. In the passage of Mr. Gadd quoted by Dr. Prannath there is nothing to show that Gungunum is Ishtar. Moreover, Ishtar of the Babylonians was not a moon-goddess but a goddess of love and war. Their moon-god was Sin or Nannar at Ur. Moreover, "Yaa Gungur yaa sinivali yaa Raakaa" (Rig. II, 32, 8) does not prove that Gungu means moon-goddess. It may mean that Gungu means Raakaa, but then, Raakaa is not moon but the night of the full moon. Therefore, Raakesh—the Lord of the night—means moon. So, Gungu may mean "the night," and not "the moon."

SHIPRA AND SIPPAR.

The identification of the Sumerian city Sippar with the Rigvedic word "Shipra" is utterly wrong. Shipra in all the passages of the Rigveda means "visor" and not the name of a city. Rig. (V, 54, 11) mentions Shipra as "Shipraah shrishasu" which means Shipraas on the head. The rest of the hymn is: "Lances on your shoulders, anklets on your feet, gold chains on your breasts" etc. So, does Dr. Prannath mean that in this narration while speaking of lances, etc. the hymn abruptly speaks of the Sumerian city of Sippar at the heads of persons mentioned therein ? So, "Shipra-in" means "one possessed of the visor"; it does not mean the king of Shipra. If Shipra means Sippar, may I ask why it does not mean Zipporah, the daughter of Jethro and the wife of Moses of the Old Testament. And if such were the canons of interpretation of the Vedas there would be no end to all the histories of the world finding a lodgment in these texts of the ancients.

UMA AND UMMA.

The Rigvedic word Uma has been said to be the Sumerian city Umma and it is said that the

people of this city are mentioned in the Rigveda as having beautiful clothes or houses. The hymns referred to are most probably Rig. III, 6, 8 and IV, 19, 1 where we come across the words "Suhavasa Uma." Dr. Prannath has split the word "suhavasa" as "suha-vasa" and has rendered it as "beautiful clothes or houses." This is wrong. The Sanskrit word for "beautiful clothes" is "Su-vasa" (Vide Rig. I, 124, 7; III, 8, 4; X, 75, 8; 107, 9). "Suh" does not mean "beautiful." Therefore, the correct splitting of "suhavasah" is "su-havasah", meaning "good to hear" or "prompt to hear." In both the above hymns Uma is an adjective to Devah and means "helpers" from the root "av" to help, the principal factors being the Devas. Even if we admit that Uma does not mean "helpers" we fail to understand how it can ever denote a city, for a city never wears beautiful clothes. To say that Umma is the name of a city in Sumerian history while Uma is the name of a people is too far-fetched an explanation. Where is the city of Uma in the Rigveda ? Dr. Prannath says that Uma had achieved great political power, so much so, that the Maruts like the Hittites brought water and earth to it from the kingdom

of Puru (Rig. I, 166, 3). So, Does Dr. Prannath mean to say that there was neither earth nor water at Uma or the Sumerian city of Umma and both these "precious things" had to be brought from the kingdom of Puru? Is there any similar tradition in Sumerian history? If so, why has Dr. Prannath kept it to himself? The fact is that there was plenty of both earth and water at Umma and Maruts had no need of carrying these precious things to that city. It is all mishandling the texts. Moreover, "Hitaiva" means "like loving friends." If "Hitaiva" means "like the Hittites" then Dr. Prannath should let us know when the Hittites carried water and earth to Umma or to any other country? Moreover, if "Hit" means the "Hittite" why should "iva" mean "Like", for this is Sanskrit. It may stand for the Babylonian "E-a," and so there be no end to all these conjectures. Whatever serves his purpose Dr. Prannath regards as Sumerian or Babylonian, and the rest he regards as Sanskrit. This will not do. If the Rigveda is a Sumerian document one should be able to interpret at least one hymn out of its more than a thousand hymns from

Sumerian language. Dr. Prannath has not quoted even a single hymn where Uma could be correctly interpreted as the name of a city.

PARA AND FARA.

Rigvedic Para is said to be the well-known city Fara and Dr. Prannath regards this Para as the battle-ground where the mighty Ushan was made to eat the humble pie. Dr. Prannath has cleverly avoided all references here because he does not feel sure of his ground. It is the foremost duty of a scholar, when he thinks of coming to print, to come with full references to avoid unnecessary labour on the part of those who wish to understand him thoroughly. In finding out the reference in question I had to waste full three hours by going through every hymn in which Para has been mentioned. It appears that from Rig. (Ushanaa yat paraavato I, 130, 9; VIII, 7, 263) Dr. Prannath concludes that Ushnaa belonged to Para, and from Rig. (Ushanaa vadham yamat V, 34, 2) he thinks that Ushanaa was killed at Para. And this story he associates with the battle between the Sumerian kings Ush and Enannatum and says

that the information regarding the plaoe where Ush was defeated is supplied by the Rigveda. Well, Rigveda nowhere speaks of Ushanaa having been killed at Para, the utmost Dr. Prannath can say is that Ushanaa was killed and that he belonged to Para. But where is the hymn which speaks of Ushanaa having been killed at Para ? The Rigveda has no such hymn. Moreover, Para is not the name of a city. The proof for this is that Para is seen in most cases coming with its correlative Avar, Purva or Arvak (Vide Param-Avaram X, 87, 3; 120, 7; 67,4; 17, 3; V, 3, 5; Para-Avar VI, 9, 2-3; Arvak-Para X, 71, 9) which mean the upper and the lower, the first and the last, the posterior and the anterior, etc. Besides, if Ushanaa belonged to the city of Para, how does Dr. Prannath in his comparative list of western and Rigvedic kings put him down as belonging to the city of Umma. It is all confusion worse confounded.

SHIR AND SHIR-PUR-LA

The paragraph dealing with the Semetio city of Lagas formerly known as Shir-pur-la

is full of so much confusion that one cannot make either head or tail of it. There is no reference nor is there any clear idea given. Rajas is said to be the name of a city which finds no support in the Rigveda. The paragraph is full of inexcusable conjectures unbecoming in a scholar.

SHARDHA AND CHALDEA.

Shardha is said to be Chaldea with which it has no similarity. Moreover, Shardha in the Rigveda (V, 28, 3) is a verb, not a noun. Shardha as a noun means a troop or strength (Vide Apte). If the Sumerian kings of Susa and Avan used the title of Shardh-u or Shardo it must have meant the mighty ones. That is, if we take it for granted that the Rigvedic Shardha and the Sumerian Shardha are one and the same. Of course, no reasonable scholar can have any objection to admitting some common words between different languages, say, between the Sumerian and the Rigvedic languages. But that is altogether different from saying that the Rigveda is a Sumerian

document. One can as well say that Charit (Rig 1, 113, 5) is Chaldea. Scholarship requires one to interpret at least the whole hymn and not to cull out a word here and mutilate a word there and then to impose an astounding theory on the gaping world.

MAGHAVAN AND AVAN.

Dr. Prannath splits up the Rigvedic word Maghavan as Mah-avan and reads in it the story of Sumerian city Awan. He also points out that Maha in *Sanskrit and Mah in Sumerian mean the same thing—the great. So Maghavan of the Veda means the great city of Awan. In this connection it has to be pointed out that the name of the Sumerian city is Awan and nowhere in the language of Sumer has the city been mentioned as Maha-awan. What then makes Dr. Prannath seek resemblance between Sumerian Awan and Maghavan. If the name of the city is Maghavan in the Rigveda it should be the same in Sumerian. It is unnatural to split a word like this and try to find out a thing which does not exist there. Moreover, if you split Maghavan as Maha-avan

then, according to the Sanskrit grammar the word should be Mahaavan and not Maghavan, even if we admit the unaccountable change of "h" into "gh." No philologist would support a parallel between Sanskrit (Sinha) and Punjabi (Singha) on the one hand and Sumerian and Sanskrit on the other. Parallel should be drawn from Sumerian language to prove that the Sumerian "h" changes into "gh" in Sanskrit.

SUS AND SŪSĀ.

A parallel has been drawn between the Sumerian Susa and the Rigvedic Sus. But really speaking the Vedic word is not Sus but Shush and Dr. Prannath has abbreviated it to Sus to make it suit his theory. Besides this, Shush, as such, is mentioned not even in a single place in the Rigveda. The word that is mentioned is Shushma. Shush in Sanskrit means 'to be dried' and Shushma means 'that which dries up' that is, the sun. Secondarily, it means the powerful, and Shush-min-tam means the most powerful. When there is no likeness between the words Susa and Shushma, it is needless to

talk of other things connected with this supposed Sumerian city in the Rigveda.

ERMA AND ALAM.

Dr. Prannath speaks of the Vedic word Erma as the Sumerian city Elam. But, for Dr. Prannath's enlightenment I may point out that there is a word Elam (Rig I, 31, 1) in the Rigveda and that would suit his theory better, for he does not care whether the whole text admits of a coherent interpretation or not with his supposed Sumerian words interspersed in the hymn.

RURU-BHU AND LULU-BHU.

Ruru-bhu is said to be a word mentioned in the sacred text, while the fact is that this word is mentioned nowhere in the whole of the Rigveda. The word mentioned is Ruruhu (V, 7, 5) which is the verb from the root 'ruh' to grow. Rurukshani is mentioned in Rig. IX, 48, 2 but then it is not Ruru-bhu which it should be if any similarity has to be sought with the word Lulubu.

AAVIS AND OPIS.

Opis has been identified with Aavis but why

not with Apis(1, 26, 3). The latter bears greater resemblance to the word Opis.

Dr. Prannath's way of reading Sumerian words in the Rigveda is curious. He does not care for the entire hymn. He picks up pieces of words, sometimes splits them into unnatural parts and easily finds a similarity between a Sumerian and a Rigvedic word. If this method of interpretation of the Vedas were to be accepted then you could find anything and everything in the Veda. To illustrate, I am giving underneath some names from the Old Testament which according to Dr. Prannath's method of interpretation are to be found in the Rigveda. Dr. Prannath's list of Rigvedic kings, which he says is the result of his several years' labours in the Rigveda, is similarly ridiculous. My list is as follows:—

Names of the Old Testament in the Rigveda.

OLD TESTAMENT.	RIGVEDA.
Abraham.	Abrahma (IV, 16, 9; X, 105, 8)
Sarah—Abraham's wife.	Sarah (VII, 103, 7)
Moses.	Mosh-ath (V, 54, 6)

Zippotah—wife of Moses.	Siprab (V, 54, II; VIII, 7,25).
Aarron—brother of Moses.	Arun (1,105, 18; 130, 9).
Noah.	Nu (1, 8, 5).
Isaac.	Asaac-t (1, 33, 3)
Ishi or Isaiah.	Isha-na (I, 87, 4).
Pharoah.	Purohitah (VI, 70, 4).

Dr. Prannath may say that the above list goes to support his theory. So I am giving another list showing that English Eugenical terms are to be seen in the Rigveda.

ENGLISH.	RIGVEDA.
Sperma	Saparyem (11, 63, 3).
Ovum	Avam (1,105, 4, IV, 1, 5).
Ameba	Ameva (VI, 74. 2)

I would like Dr. Prannath's opinion regarding the above list. Needless to say that this list can be further lengthened by the addition of many more words.

II

Dr. Prannath has attempted the translation of one Sukta of the Rigveda (1, 133, 1—7) to prove his theory that the book is a Sumerian document. He says that in this Sukta there is a detailed mention of the battle between Balulu

A-anni-padda, the Semeic king and Awan, the Aryan king. The battle was waged at Bel. And, Dr. Prannath manufactures a story out of the Rigveda (1, 133,1—7) and says that this is a contribution of the Rigveda to the history of Sumer and Akkad. It has to be noted that the story that has been read by Dr. Prannath in the hymns in question is not mentioned in the documents available regarding Sumer and Akkad and so if Dr. Prannath's interpretation of the hymn is wrong, then the whole story turns into a magnificent myth. I am, therefore, giving my translation of the Sukta and leave it to the scholars to decide whether Dr. Prannath has not done injustice to the Vedic texts.

I may also point out before commencing the translation that the basis of Dr. Prannath's conjecture is a passage in Mr. Gadd's book in which we read that A-anni-padda belonged to the first dynasty of Ur. After him came Meskem Nannar, A-anni-padda's son, who ruled for 36 years. After him Elulu and Balulu, who are not stated to have belonged to the same family, ruled for 25 and 36 years. Then comes the

customary formula: "Ur was smitten with arms and its kingdom passes to Awan." This is the only data on which Dr. Parunath builds the theory of the battle of Bel, which finds no mention in the Sumerian document. Even if we take for granted that the translation done by Dr. Prannath is correct—which, as I shall presently show, is most fantastical—the incongruities between the Sumerian as well as the Rigvedic histories are so glaring that one cannot believe anything in common in them. Here is a comparison:—

SUMERIAN.

1. It mentions Balulu as the 4th ruler after A-anni-padda.
2. The name is Balulu.
3. It does not mention any battle of Bel.

RIGVEDA.

1. It makes no distinction between Balulu and Inapada and treats them as one and the same.
2. The name is Vatur, which Dr. Prannathsays is the same as Balulu.
3. It mentions the battle of Bel, which is conjectured from the word Vailsthaan, but which in Sanskrit means a pit.

So from the above analysis we can understand that the only possible similarity is in two names; Balulu—Vatur; A-anni-padda—Inapada. One may rightly question the similarity between Balulu and Vatur. About Inapada, Dr. Prannath should explain why the Sumerian document speaks of the two kings with a reign of 61 years intervening—between A-anni-padda and Balulu while the Rigvedic document regards both the names as one and the same. Really speaking, the words are not 'Vatur inaapaada' but "Vaturinnaa padaa" and both the words are in the instrumental case according to Sanskrit grammar, and mean 'with a broad, wide foot' as will be explained in the following translation.

1.

Ubhe	both
Riten druho	truth's enemies
Anindraah	becomes free from the enemies of Indra.
Hataa	have been killed
Pari-trilhaa	pierced and mangled
Punaami	I purify

Dahaami-sam (samdahaami)	I completely burn
Abhivlagya	Surrounded on all sides
Amitras	the enemies
Asheran	they lay
Rodasi	earth and heaven
Mahir	earth
Yatra	where
Vailsthaanam	in the pits

Here Indra is said to have burnt and routed his enemies who have been surrounded on all sides and, thus slaughtered, have been thrown into pits.

"ABHIVLAGYA" AND "BABYLON."

Dr. Prannath picks up two words out of the hymn, 'Abhivlagya' and 'Vail,' and translates them 'Babylon' and 'Bel' respectively. He says that the hymn speaks of the Babylonians having been killed at the battle of Bel. May I ask what the similarity is between Abhivlagya and Babylon. Dr. Prannath thinks it to be a word of Semetic origin. Why? "Abhi" is a Sanskrit prefix to verbs and nouns meaning 'on all sides.' Why should it be Semetic? 'Vli' is a

Sanskrit root which means 'to go,' 'to move.' Dr. Prannath should consult Apte'e dictionary. 'Abhi' with 'Vli' means to go round or to make manoeuvres. Abhivlagya, according to Sanskrit grammar, plainly means 'having made military manoeuvres.' The way in which Dr. Prannath seeks similarities is curious. To read Babylon in abhivlagya he splits the word in to A-bhivla-gya, and picks up bhivla, removes the h, again changes it into bibla and identifies it with Babylon. Why not say Babylon is Baby-lon, that is, baby-lion, that is, a baby who possessed as much strength in his childhood as a lion ? And you must have read the story of Bharat, who caught hold of the manes of lions when he was a child. He is regarded as the founder of the Indian (Bharat) Empire, and he must have founded Babylon, as the name of the city indicats. Following the line of interpretation that Dr. Prannath has followed, one can as well say that Abhivlagyas were the Bhils of India If bhivla can be interpreted as Babylonians, it can more easily be interpreted as Bhils.

VAILSTHAAN.

Then, again, Vailsthaan has been interpreted as the city of Bel. This is also ridiculous. Vil, vilva, vilsthaan, vailsthaan in Sanskrit mean a pit—the place of burial of the dead. In Hindi we call the bull 'Bail.' So, why should not the Hindi word 'Bail' signify the city of Bel ?

2.

Abhivlagya	Surrounding
Yaatumatinaam	of the enemies
Mahaavaturinaa	with great wide
Chit	only
Chhindhi	crush
Padaa	foot
adrivah	O thrower of the thunderbolt
Vaturinaa	with wide
Shirshaa	the heads
padaa	foot

Here also the meaning of the hymn is quite clear. The enemies have been surrounded on all sides and their heads have been crushed under the wide feet (of elephants).

KING INAAPADAA.

Dr. Prannath speaks of the king Inaapadaa

in this hymn. There are two pieces—'Vaturinaa padaa' and 'Mahaa vaturinaa padaa' Dr. Prannath splits the former as 'Vatur Inaapadaa' and the latter as 'Mahaa Vatur Inaapadaa.' Vatur-inapaadaa he further splits as Vat-Ur-inna-pada and translates it as the high-priest of the fortified city of Ur. But Mahaa-Vatur-inaapadaa he interprets as the mighty Balul Anni-padda. Now, the difference in Vatur-inaapadaa and Mahaa-Vatur-inaapadaa is only this: that while the latter has Mahaa prefixed to the word the former does not have it. 'Mahaa,' according to Dr. Prannath means, 'the great.' So the meanings of both the words should be the same, for the words are the same, excepting the difference that may be due to the addition of the word 'Mahaa.' But Dr. Prannath interprets the same words differently.

'Vaturin' in Sanskrit means broad, wide (see Apte). Vaturinaa is the instrumental case of Vaturin, just as Karinaa is of Karin. Padaa, again, is instrumental of Pad and means 'with foot.' So both the words grouped together mean 'with wide foot.' There is no Semetic word in the hymn which may require a far-fetched explanation.

3.

"MAGHAVAN."

Ava-aasaam	of these
Maghavan	O maghavan
Jahi	destroy
Shardhah	strength
Yaatumatiinaam	of the enemies
Vailsthaanake	in the place of pit
Armake	Narrow
Mahaa	in the great
Vailsthe	pit
Armake	narrow (throw them).

In continuation of the previous narration the hymn speaks of Maghava destroying the strength of the enemies and throwing them in the great narrow pit.

Dr. Prannath splits the word 'Avaasaam' as ava-asa-am and interprets it as the Lord of the people of Ava. 'Aasaam' in Sanskrit means 'of these' and 'av' is a prefix which goes with the verb 'jahi' making it 'avjahi,' which means 'kill out-right.' Dr. Prannath's method of interpretation is nothing short of fantastic. How would Dr. Prannath like his own name to be interpreted as follows: Praannaath–Pra-anna-ath–

P r a–Fara–a Sumerian city; anna–annani–A-anni-padda–the Semetic king who was defeated at Bel, the Vailsthaan of the Rigveda; ath–ad–the Adites who are mentioned in the Koran. So Praannaath means, the city of Fara, the king of Annapadda and the tribe of Ad. It may sound pedantic and scholarly, but all the same it is nothing but absurd.

Dr. Prannath splits the word Maghavan as Maha-avan. I have already written about it and so I need not repeat the same here. About 'Shardho' also, which Dr. Prannath interprets as Chaldea, I have already given the correct interpretation. It means 'strength' in Sanskrit. 'Armake' is another word which Dr. Prannath interprets as Armean country of Nippur. 'Armak' in Sanskrit means 'narrow' (Vide-Apte).

4.

Yaasaam	of whom
Tat	that deed
manaayati	is counted
tisrah panchashato	thrice fifty
su	easy
te	your

Manaayati	counted
abhivlaugair	by the manoeuvres being surrounded
takat	small
su	easy
te	your
apaavapah	have been killed

"Indra killed 150 soldiers of the enemy's camp by surrounding them on all sides. That deed though difficult is counted easy."

Here again we come across the word abhivlagya, but Dr. Prannath instead of interpreting it as the Babylonians renders it as "archers," whereas according to plain Sanskrit it means "by the operations of surrounding them on all sides" "Apaavapah" has been translated as "have stopped the water," which even if it were to be understood in that sense throws no light on the Sumerian or Babylonian history. "Takat" has been wrongly translated as "wooden." Perhaps, Dr. Prannath thought of the Hindi word "Takhat" which means "the wooden bed." His whole translation is highly ridiculous.

5.

Pishanga-bhrishtim	of reddish-brown colour
Ambrinam	roaring
pishaacham	fiendish enemy
Indra	O Indra
Sammrin	root out
Sarvam	All
Rakshah	the guards
nibarhaya	destroy

The hymn says: O Indra, root out the roaring fiendish enemies of reddish-brown colour and destroy all their guards.

Dr. Prannath regards the word Pishanga as Semetic, for which he gives no authority. Pishanga means reddish-brown colour according to Apte's dictionary as well as Saayan; "Ambhrinam" means roaring from the root "bhran" to roar.

6.

Avar	the enemy's guard
maha	great
Indra	O Indra
dadrihi	thou hast torn down
Shrudhi	hear thou us

nah shushoch	think of us
hi	verily
dyauh	heaven
kshaah	earth
na	like
bhiishaah	fierce
adrivah	O thrower of thunder-bolt
ghrinaan	Contemptuous
na	like
bhiishaah	terrible
adrivah	throwing thunder-bolts
shushmintamah	mightiest amid the mighty ones
he	verily
shushmibhi	with strength
Vadhair	destructions
ugrebhih	terrible
iiyase	comes
Apuurushaghnah	not slaying own people
apratiitah	unnoticed
Shursatvabhih	accompanied with the brave
trisaptaih	three by seven
shuursatvabhih	accompsnied with the best brave

"O Indra, thou hast broken down the great guard of the enemy. O Indra, hear thou our

prayers and think of us. Verily, heaven looks as fierce as the earth (after this fierce battle). O thrower of thunder-bolt, thou art as terrible as the contemptuous thunder-throwing enemy. O most mighty amid the mighty ones, verily, thou comest with terrible destroying strength. Destroy not thy own people; remain among them all but unnoticed, thou accompanied by three times seven of the best brave men."

"Na shushocha" has been translated by Dr. Prannath as "think of us." Why? Why not "shushocha" be split up as Shush-ocha—Shush-Sus—the people of Susa. Shush-min-tam has been interpreted as the noble Lord of Susa. About this I have already made my remarks.

7.

Vanoti	He gains
hi	verily
suuvan	offering
kshayam	habitation
Pariinasah	bound on all sides
suuvaano	making offering
hi	verily
samyajati	killed

avdvishah	enemies
devaanaam	of Devas
Sunvan	making offering
it	verily
sisaasati	he enjoys
Sahasra vaaji aavritah	surrounded with horses
Sunvaanaaya	for the one making offerings
Indra	Indra
dadaati	gives
aabhuvam	lasting
rayim	wealth
dadaato	gives
aabhuvam	lasting

"Verily, making offerings he gains a place of habitation. Making offerings he verily killed the enemies of the Devas who were bound on all sides. Verily, making offerings he enjoys (life) surrounded with thousand horses. For him who makes offerings Indra gives lasting wealth, aye, everlasting wealth."

The reader will notice the word "Devaanaam" in the hymn. Why did not Dr. Prannath split the word as Deva-anaam and interpret it as the high-priests of Anaam, for this

is just in keeping with his method of interpretation.

It is clear from the above translation, which is done according to the accepted Sanskrit meanings of the words of the hymns, that Dr. Prannath has mutilated words and has made them yield meaning which is not contained in them. My translation is natural, clear and proceeds with the accepted sense of the Sanskrit words.

III

In his third article contributed to the "Illustrated Weekly of India" Dr. Prannath makes an astounding claim that one-fifth of the Rigveda is connected with Egypt. He says that the people of Ava tribe, according to the Rigveda, came from Egypt and in support of his theory gives some words from the Rigveda which he thinks are not of Sanskrit origin and can be interpreted only by the help of the Egyptian Dictionary of Budge. He also gives a list of Egyptian kings from the Rigveda, which, he says, tallies with Manetho's table

and which to Dr. Prannath is a conclusive proof of the Rigveda being connected with Egypt.

Let us first see which are the words that cannot be found in Sanskrit dictionaries.

INDRA-TVOTAA.

Dr. Prannath thinks that Tvotaa (1, 8, 3) has no meaning in Sanskrit. Now, this is altogether wrong. Tvotaa according to plain Sanskrit means Tvaa-Uutaa equal to "protected or aided by thee." The difficulty raised by Dr. Prannath is just like the following. He writes in this very article which I am examining: 'They contain a good number of words which cannot be found in Sanskrit dictionaries.' Now, I say that Dr. Prannath has written: 'the yeon taina goodnum berof wordswh ichcan notbef oundin Sanskrit diction aries.' No English dictionary will give any meaning of any of the words thus written by Dr. Prannath and it can be proved that the article written by him is not in English. Similarly, Tvotaa is not a single word. It contains two words–'Tvaa'

and 'Uutaa'—and each of them has a meaning according to any Sanskrit dictionary, however small it may be. 'Indra tvotaa' means 'protected by thee O Indra'

TVAM TAM INDRA......TUVI JAATAA.

In this hymn (1, 131, 7) Dr. Prannath thinks the word Tuvi is Egyptian, for it has no meaning in Sanskrit. Tuvi, according to Apte, means 'much, many, strong, powerful.' 'Tuvijaat' means 'born powerful' 'Tvam' means 'you,' 'tam' means 'him' and the whole hymn means: 'O Indra, born powerful, kill him—our enemy.' Every word in the hymn has a meaning according to Sanskrit Dictionary and I wonder what makes Dr. Prannath say that these words are Egyptian.

NETHI-SHTHE.

Dr. Prannath interprets the word as 'in the place of God Neith.' Well, the word (1, 132, 1) is not 'Nethi-shthe' but 'Nedi-shthe' and Dr. Prannath has wrongly spelled it as Nethi to give it a resemblance to the Egyptian word Neith. 'Nedishthe', moreover, is not a word which admits of splitting like 'Nedi' and 'shthe'.

It means, according to Sanskrit Grammar, 'nearest.' 'Ned' means near and 'shth' is the superlative suffix like 'est' in English.

K-RAANASYA.

This word (1, 132, 2) is derived from the root 'Kri' equal to 'to do' and 'Kraana' means 'One who does'. 'Kraanasya' is the genetive of 'Kraana.'

APAAKAA.

This has been equated with the Egyptian city Apaqa, but in Sanskrit it means (Ap-ach) equal to 'coming from a distant place'. (Vide Apte).

PARAA-VATO.

It (1, 130, 1) means 'from a distant country'.

NESHI.

It (1, 129, 50) is a form of the verb 'Ni' equal to 'to reach.' 'Neshi' means 'you bring within reach.'

SAT.

Sat-pati (1, 130, 1) means 'Lord of all existence,' for 'Sat' means 'existence.'

So all the words cited by Dr. Prannath as

having no meaning according to Sanskrit dictionary have a dictionary meaning.

VEDIC PROTOTYPE OF PHARAOH.

The other argument given by him is that these words, which he wrongly calls Egyptian, are found in hymns which have been revealed by the sage 'Paruchchhevi' equal to Parush-Sevi, meaning the high-priest in the service of Pharaoh. Dr. Prannath has wrongly given the name of the sage as Paruch-'chhevi,' which can be construed as Paruch-Sevi. The word in the text is not chhevi, but 'chhep' and the whole word is Paruchchhep. 'Paru' in Sanskrit means 'joint' and 'shep' means 'colour and form.' Probably the English word 'shape' is akin to the Vedic 'shep', the pronunciation of both of which is alike. So Paruchchhep means one who possesses colour and form in every joint, that is, a most handsome person. 'Shep' also means the generative organ.

As regards the interpretation of Paru as Pharaoh, may I suggest that 'Purohitah' (VI, 70, 4) possesses far greater semblance to 'Pharaoh' than 'Paru,' though both the words have their

own meaning in Sanskrit which has nothing to do with the Egyptian Pharaoh. The readers should also bear in mind that there is no priest named as Paruchchhep in the Egyptian records and the only data on which Dr. Prannath bases his conjecture is his wrong etymology, about which I have repeatedly made references in my articles.

LIST OF EGYPTIAN KINGS.

Besides giving a number of words from the Rigveda, Dr. Prannath has also given a list of Egyptian kings, which he says, tallies in order with Manetho's table. Let us examine his list and compare it with Manetho's list. For the information of the reader, I am giving here comparative lists of Egyptian kings according to different authorities and the readers can judge for themselves how far Dr. Prannath follows any particular list. It is amusing to note that Dr. Prannath sticks to no particular list. He confounds them all, and picks out words now from this and now from that list and puts the reader on the wrong track by saying that he is following the order of Manetho's table. Here are the various lists:—

Prannath's Rigvedic list	Prannath's Egyptian list	Petrie	Budge	Manetho	Sety I,	Wadell's Puranic list
		FIRST	DYNASTY			
Manas	Menes	Nor-mer, Men	Aha	Menes	Mena, Manj.	Asa Manj. s of Kuni or Sakuni.
Tati	Teta	Aha	Narmer	Athothis	Teta	Anjana, Ansumat, s. of Asa-Manja.
Naar-Medh	Naar-Mer	Zer-ta	Khent	Kenkenes	Atta	Kunti-jit, Ritu-jit, or Dili-pa, s. of Anjan
Shu (Shan)	...	Zet-Ata	Tcha	Uenephes	Ata	Bhagi-ratha, g.s. of Ansu-mat
Ava	...	Den-Setui	Ten, Semti	Usapha-ides	Hesepti	Devana-kshatra, or Aristha-nemi s. of Kunti-jit.
Ka	Qa-a	Azab-Merpaba	Atab	Miebidos	Mer-ba-p	......
Ka (Ishi)		Semerkhet Shemshu.	Hu (?)	Semempses	Sem-en ptah (?)	......
Sapta (-Rishi)	He-Septi	Qa Sen	Qa or Sen (Qebhu)	Bienekhes	Kebh	Shruta
AAUR.	ATCH-AB					Suhotra(III)

LISTS DON'T TALLY AT ALL !

So the reader can compare himself what similarity there exists between the supposed Rigvedic list of Egyptian kings and Manetho's list which has been taken from Waddell's "Egyptian Civilization—its Sumerian Origin." Dr. Prannath has mixed up all lists and has given an impression to the reader that all the pre-historic kings of Egypt given by him are mentioned in the Veda nearly in the same order as found in Manetho's table. The fact is that Teta, Naar-mer, Qa-a, Atch-ab are not at all found in Manetho's table. Teta is found in Sety's list, Naar-mer, Qa-a and Atab are found in Budge's list. Even if we take for granted that the Rigvedic list given by Dr. Prannath is of Egyptian kings, a careful study of the Suktas in question reveals that the order given by Dr. Prannath is not supported by the Rigveda. He has picked up words from here and there and left others which smash his theory to pieces. He gives names of 19 kings and says that they are mentioned in a definite order from X, 129 to X, 152. A careful examination of the

Suktas reveals that there is no such order. He assigns Ava the 5th place in his list while Ava is mentioned twice (X, 129, I–2) even before the mention of Manas (X, 129, 4). Ka (X,129, 6) is again mentioned after Manas, that is, before the mention of Tati, Naar-medh, Shu and Ava. In Prannath's list Manas stands at the top, but the name having been mentioned once in X, 129, 4 is again mentioned after Tati in X, 130, 6. Dr. Prannath assigns Vishvaa the 10th place in the second dynasty of his list, but we have the name in 132, 4, that is, in the first dynasty even before the fourth king Shu. Archan has been assigned the 3th place, while we have the word in X, 133, 1, that is, after Shu the fourth king.

SAPTA RISHI.

Sapta–Rishi has been assigned the 8th place, while the word is not at all mentioned in X, 137, 1–7. Sapta-Rishis are mentioned as the sages who revealed the Sukta and their name is altogether missing in the hymns. Similarly, Aamava, to whom Dr. Prannath assigns the 9th place, is not at all mentioned in the hymns. He is also the sage who revealed 138 Sukta, but his name is also absent both in the Sukta as well as

in the hymns. Dr. Prannath assigns the 12th place to Atri-Saamkhya, but this name also is not in the hymns (X, 143). He is also the sage who revealed the Sukta.

So, this is the wonderful list of Egyptian kings said to have been found by Dr. Prannath in the Rigveda. Undoubtedly it is 'revolutionary,' for it disregards all the fundamental principles of research. A student of the Veda can at once say that the list given by Dr. Prannath is not at all a list. Out of 112 hymns, each covering on the average 20 or more words, he has found out a list of 19 names, each comprising of one or two syllables and each name placed from the other at an interval of 60 or 70 words. A list is not mentioned in this manner. A careful study of each so-called name will prove that every word is a common noun and Dr. Prannath, because of his mistaken and antiquated notions of philology, interprets it as the name of an Egyptian king. 'Manas' means mind and in the hymn in question means: 'Thereafter rose desire in the Mind in the beginning.' 'Tati' means to stretch; 'Nri-medh' is a social sacrifice: 'Shu' means to

produce; 'Ava' is to protect; 'Ka' is who; Sapta-Rishis are the seven sages; 'Aaurava' means related to the earth or produced from the thigh; 'Vishva' means all; 'Shamyu' means giving happiness; 'Krishanam' means pearl, gold, form or shape; 'Innar' means 'It-nar' equal to man; 'Archan' means worshipper; 'Preva' means 'Praiva'; 'Viveh' is a verb which in the text means 'has brought'; 'shaas' means to govern.

A "THRILLING" FACT!

Dr. Prannath writes: "The most thrilling fact is that the famous high-priest Sheri of the Egyptian king Per-Ab or the Rigveda Preva is stated in the Rigveda as a Rishi of the hymns (Rig. X, 147) dealing probably with the same ruler." This is a wrong statement and is most unbecoming in a scholar. The Rishi of the hymns X, 147 is not Sheri, but Airammad and so all the thrill of Dr. Prannath is a self-delusion.

In his fourth article, Dr. Prannath has developed thet heory that the original Aryans were regarded as enemies by the Semetics and who wandering from place to place, founding

various settlements at Lybia, Syria, Greece, Cyprus, Phoenicia, etc. ultimately settled at Mohenjo-daro and Harappa. The theory may be true or may not be true. Following Mr. A.C. Das, one may as well argue that the Ribhus were adventurous colonizers from India who, starting from Mohenjo-daro and Harappa, established their colonies in the valley of Euphrates and Tigris and thence migrated to Lybia and Egypt. Undoubtedly there is much in common between the mythologies of both Egypt and India and arguments favouring batches of Indian colonizers expanding to foreign lands towards the East and West are far too numerous. But here we are not concerned with that.

A BABYLONIAN GODDESS.

Dr. Prannath, in this connection, has sought to interpret a Rigvedic hymn (X, 106, 7) in the light of a Babylonian representation which depicts on a stone the Goddess Lamme seizing serpents and riding away on an ass in a boat. Dr. Prannath says that the Babylonian Goddess Lamme is the Rigvedic Taame and the other particulars are also the same as mentioned in

the hymn X, 106, 7. This is against all facts. There is no Goddess Taame mentioned in that part of the hymn in which Dr. Prannath reads the interpretation of the Babylonian representation. There are the words "Taa" and "Me" both having independent meanings in the previous hymn, that is, X, 106, 6 and Dr. Prannath cleverly picks out these two words only and leaves the rest of the hymn comprising of about 30 words untouched, he also leaves aside the first portion of the next hymn and joins these two words with the latter part of the hymn and wrongly says that the Babylonian Goddess Lamme is mentioned in that hymn as Taame.

Moreover, there are only two words in the Rigvedic hymn which have set Dr. Prannath on wild conjectures. One word is 'Ribhu' and the other is 'Khar.' There is no mention of "Taame with Ribhu serpents in her hands" for there is no mention in the hymn either of Taame or of serpents. Besides this, no scholar of the Veda will admit that Taa-me is a Rigvedic God or Goddess, for there is no such deity in the whole of the Vedic literature. Simply be-

cause Taa-me has some phonetic similarity with Lamme, there is no justification to regard it as a deity. Dr. Prannath should come forth with his data from the Rigveda to support his hypothesis that Taa-me is the name of a deity. I wish Dr. Prannath were to cultivate the habit of clear thinking, for that would save him from many a pit-fall in which he has fallen all through his 'laborious researches.'

I have nothing to say regarding other articles of Dr. Prannath which he has written on Mohenjodaro and Harapha, for that has precious little to do with the Rigveda. As regards the Rigveda, Dr. Prannath's statements are not only unwarranted, but also full of such gross misrepresentations as have surprised me out of my wits and I have all along wondered that all this could be written under the name of research and scholarship